



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/519,246	03/06/2000	Stuart K. Williams	9896.143	8260

7590 02/06/2004

FREDRIKSON & BYRON  
200 SOUTH 6TH STREET  
SUITE 4000  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-1425

EXAMINER

BARRETT, THOMAS C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3738

DATE MAILED: 02/06/2004

24

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/519,246

Applicant(s)

WILLIAMS ET AL.

Examiner

Thomas C. Barrett

Art Unit

3738

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on the amendment of December 8, 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-7,9-11,13,15-17,19 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-7,9-11,13,15-17,19 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 23.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION*****Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on December 8, 2003 has been entered.

Please Note: the Applicant in the amendment of August 26, 2002 canceled Claims 8 and 18.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed December 8, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Drumheller anticipates the present invention. The argument regarding whether Drumheller discloses an endovascular graft was previously addressed in office action 19. Contrary to the Applicant's argument, closer inspection of the structure of the text reveals Drumheller discloses ***either*** a synthetic graft or polymer coated metallic stent can be used for improvement of vascular patency (col. 8, lines 37-60). Either way one would read the text, the Applicant is only arguing an intended use of the graft. The Applicant admits on page 1, lines 12-15 that endovascular grafts "can be broadly defined as vascular grafts that are positioned within existing veins and arteries."

Drumheller does disclose a graft-covered stent (i.e. Example 41, col. 29) that can be coated with the same claim substances of the present invention, including **pro-coagulant** factors (col. 8, lines 46-48) and therefore meets the structural limitations of the claimed invention.

The Applicant does not claim a particular size for the endovascular graft. However, even if the only difference between the prior art and the claims are a recitation of relative dimensions of the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device is not patentably distinct from the prior art device. The Applicant **fails to claim** and only argues that an endovascular stent is “considerably smaller” than a vascular graft. However, it is well known in the art that both endovascular stents and vascular grafts can both be small or large depending on the vessel intended for their use. For example, an endovascular graft would be large if used for an abdominal aorta. In response to Applicant's argument that the combination of Guire and Marin et al. fails to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., to prevent endoleaking) are not recited in rejected claims 1, 5, 10, 11 and 15. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Furthermore, the primary reference of Guire discloses the covalently bonded coating on a graft as presently claimed. Marin et al. is a teaching reference that further adds the stent to create the stent-graft claimed, and the fixation “without sewing” is the motivation to combine the references, as suggested in Marin et

Art Unit: 3738

al. (col. 1, lines 66-67) and as noted in the prior two office actions. Therefore, the combination of Guire and Marin et al. meets the structural limitations presently claimed.

Both Marin et al. and Guire disclose grafts and are therefore in similar fields.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3, 6-7, 9, 11, 13, 16-17, 19 and 21 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Drumheller (5,874,165). Drumheller discloses an endovascular graft comprising collagen, von Willebrand factor or thrombin (col. 8, lines 37-60) on ePTFE (col. 1, lines 41-59).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 5, 10, 11, and 15 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guire (4,979,959) in view of Marin et al. (5,443,477). Guire discloses a vascular graft (col. 1, lines 31-32) with a thrombogenic agent such as collagen

Art Unit: 3738

covalently bonded to its surface by the activation of photoreactive groups (col. 2, lines 38-46) however Guire fails to disclose the vascular graft as part of an endovascular stent-graft. Marin et al. teaches an intraluminal stent that can be reliably and readily affixed to any graft material (col. 2, lines 9-19) thus making an endovascular graft, which permits fixation of the graft to an arterial wall without sewing (col. 1, lines 66-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of an intraluminal stent affixed to a graft material, as taught by Marin et al., to a vascular graft as per Guire, in order to permit fixation of the graft to an arterial wall without sewing.

### ***Conclusion***

All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 3738

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action:

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas C. Barrett whose telephone number is (703) 308-8295. The examiner can normally be reached Tuesday-Friday between 9:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on (703) 308-2111. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.



Thomas Barrett



**CORRINE McDERMOTT  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700**